

REMARKS

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for courtesies extended during the telephone conversation on February 3, 2004. Specifically, Applicant appreciates the efforts of the Examiner to provide Applicant with a copy of the Office Action mailed October 6, 2003.

Information Disclosure Statement

Applicant respectfully requests that the PTO-1449 that accompanied the Information Disclosure Statement filed on August 14, 2003 be returned with the next subsequent Office Action.

All Claims are in Condition for Allowance

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Stanek (US 6,046,754), claims 1-7 and 12-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Eichenlaub (US 6,590,605), claims 7-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Tabata et al. (US 6,417,895), and claim 13 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Mosley (US 5,583,674). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Independent claims 1 and 7 both recite a liquid crystal display device including “a light shutter on the liquid crystal display to transmit or shut off a light emitted from the liquid crystal display panel.”

In contrast to Applicant’s claimed invention, Stanek discloses, in FIG. 2A, a shutter device 200 provided at both sides of a display 20. Stanek teaches that the shutter is for protecting the screen from ambient light, not to transmit or shut off light emitted from the liquid crystal display panel as claimed herein.

Eichenlaub discloses a stereoscopic display device, wherein a secondary LCD 35 changes a polarization direction based upon application of a voltage. Specifically, Applicant respectfully asserts that Eichenlaub teaches (col. 3, lines 31-34) that when no voltage is applied across the second liquid crystal layer 38, light simply passes through it and through the polarized strips 32 of the second polarizing sheet. Conversely, Eichenlaub teaches (col. 3, lines 42-47) that when voltage is applied across the second liquid crystal layer 38, the polarization direction of the light passing through it changes by 90 degrees. Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that Eichenlaub teaches constant transmission of light through a display device.

With regard to Tabata et al., Applicant respectfully submits that the alleged light shutter 4, in FIG. 1 of Tabata et al., is actually a polarization switching liquid crystal cell that constantly transmits light. For example, Tabata et al. teaches (col. 5, lines 8-11) that the polarization switching liquid crystal cell 4 time-sequentially polarizes an incident beam, which comes from the LCD 3 and passes through a plurality of portions thereof, in units of a portion, and emits resultant light. Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that Tabata et al. teaches constant transmission of light through the polarization switching liquid crystal cell 4.

Independent claim 13 recites a method of driving a liquid crystal display panel having a light shutter including the step of “opening the light shutter at an initial interval applying the video data and closing the light shutter in a maintenance interval maintaining the video data to shut off a light from the liquid crystal display panel.” In contrast to Applicant’s claimed invention, Eichenlaub teaches constant transmission of light through a display device, as detailed above. Moreover, Mosley teaches a ferroelectric liquid crystal shutter 20 that

constantly transmits light. For example, Mosley teaches (col. 4, lines 26-32) a ferroelectric liquid crystal shutter 20 that is operated to switch the polarization of light incident on a lens 15 between a first state in which the light is essentially perpendicular to the orientation of a liquid crystal director in a non-electrode region to a second state in which the light is essentially parallel to the liquid crystal director in the non-electrode regions. Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that Mosley teaches constant transmission of light through the ferroelectric liquid crystal shutter 20.

For at least the above reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-14 are neither taught nor suggested by the applied prior art references, whether taken alone or in combination. Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(b) and 102(e) should be withdrawn because the above-discussed novel combination of features are neither taught nor suggested by any of the applied references.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests the reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner believe that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS

By: 

David B. Hardy

Reg. No. 47,362

Date: March 4, 2004

Customer No. 09629
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
Telephone: 202-739-3000